



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE NEWLY DISCOVERED CHANÇUN DE WILLAME

PART III

Continuing our rapid examination of the *Willame*, we find in ll. 1400–1703 a number of passages which have occurred earlier in the poem—ll. 1041–1106. Ll. 1400–32, for example, appear to be a simple variation of ll. 1041–58; 1483–1505, of 1064–85; 1561–63, of 1086–88; 1679–1703, of 1089–1106. To examine all of these passages would require too much space, hence a brief examination of one of them will have to suffice.

In ll. 1041–58, Guibor serves a bountiful repast before a famished knight, Girart, who has just brought news of Vivien's fearful danger, and who has not tasted food for three days. She seats him at a table of honor (*halte table*), and stands watching him as he devours his food without raising his face from his plate. At last she says playfully to her husband that Girart, judging by his appetite, must be of his, William's, lineage; that he must be a hard man to have as a neighbor, and one who would never flee in battle.

If, now, we turn to l. 1400, we shall find a passage of thirty-three lines which resembles surprisingly the one of eighteen lines just mentioned. Many lines are almost identical. The later passage offers greater detail, and several of its sentences are considerably longer than those of the earlier passage. The events of the two passages are the same, with the difference that in ll. 1400–32 the famished knight is William himself, who has just returned defeated, bringing news of Vivien's death. One of these passages is certainly the original of the other. Can we decide which is the older? One might be tempted to apply the rule that an obscure hero is frequently deprived of an episode to the profit of a hero better known, yet this would not offer a conclusion sufficiently certain. Again, the greater length of the second passage might be taken to indicate that it is the newer of the two.

However inconclusive these considerations may be, the following points leave little doubt that the shorter passage is the

original, and that the famished knight is Girart. In the first place, the poem states that this hero had not eaten for three days (ll. 1060, 709), whereas no such information is given of William, although, to be sure, he has passed through some terrible experiences. In the second place, Guibor is represented as seating her husband at a low table, since from anguish he could not go to the high table (ll. 1401, 1402). This seems improbable, when one reflects that Guibor is offering a banquet to the noble barons of the new army, that they are doubtless present in the hall, and that it is important, above all, to impress them with the idea that William has won a victory. For the great William to sit at a low table and devour his food in such somber silence might well inspire doubts as to his victory. But, it will be said, he goes to the low table because of grief for Vivien. This cannot constitute a strong objection to what has just been brought forward, for we have already seen (l. 1358) that, on learning that his wife has gathered a new army, and that its leaders are seated at table in the hall, William ceases weeping and laughs. We have also seen how admirably Guibor conceals her own loss and her husband's defeat. Surely, she and William could carry on the deception a little farther. Another thing which does not look right is the statement by Guibor that one who eats like the famished knight must be a man who would never flee from battle. These words are well-nigh incredible, if addressed to William, who has just told her, in describing his defeat, that she is the wife of a *malveis fuieur*, *Un cuart cunte, un malveis tresturnur* (ll. 1306, 1307). Still another point. At the close of Guibor's speech (ll. 1432 ff.), William asks abruptly who will hold his fief, if he should die. At this moment his nephew, Gui, rises from his seat by the fire and says that he will succeed his uncle. The mention of possible death in the expedition which is to set out is hardly of a nature to make the knights believe that a facile victory awaits them, as Guibor has just said (ll. 1376-96). More than this, the entire scene with this charming *dan Gui*, is a purely domestic one. The uncle, aunt, and nephew converse in great intimacy; there is not the slightest trace of the hundreds of barons whom we have so recently seen feasting in the palace hall. Indeed,

beginning with l. 1400, there is no indication whatever of the presence of outsiders. The change from the noisy banqueting scene of the preceding lines is absolute.

If, now, we examine the parallel passage beginning in l. 1041, reading first the lines that precede (937 ff.), we shall see that in this passage the only persons present are Guibor, William, and Girart: the scene is one of close domestic intimacy. We need only look at the matter in this light to feel an increasing conviction that the famished knight in both passages is Girart, or, to speak by the card, that the later and longer passage has been derived directly from the earlier one, and that William has been substituted for Girart.

This impression is strengthened as one reads on. In ll. 1497–1503, for example, a hero, said to be William, is armed. The language, however, of this arming is that of a *premier adoubement*, and therefore cannot apply to William.¹ To assure oneself that it is really a *premier adoubement*, one need only read ll. 1073–81, and ll. 1540–51, the first arming of Girart and Gui. Furthermore, the passage concerning the arming of Girart is almost identical with the one describing the arming of William, to such a point that when, in this latter scene, we can discover no subject to the verb *baisad* (l. 1502), we need only look back to l. 1080 to see that the subject must be *Guiborc*.

It appears, then, that not only in the parallel passage of the famished knight, but in others as well, Girart has for some reason, been replaced by William.

The hero says in ll. 1479–82 that he will leave his lands to Gui (cf. ll. 1637, 1656). Considerable speculation has been indulged in as to the *filleul* whom in later sources, the hero makes his heir.²

William boasts, in ll. 1569 ff., of his generosity, and of the

¹ For the arming of one who is already a knight, see ll. 133–40, where important variations will be noted.

² *Moniage Guillaume I* says, ll. 67, 68: *Un sien filleul sa terre a comandé, Si li fist faire homage et flauté*, quoted by W. Cloetta, *Archiv. für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, Vol. XCIII, p. 435, cf. ll. 87 ff. *Moniage II* mentions Renoart as the heir: *idem*, p. 439. Mr. Cloetta is of the opinion that the *filleul* can be no other than Renoart: *idem*, p. 435. Foucon knows the legend making Vivien's young brother William's heir: MS of British Museum, fol. 262, ro.; MS of Bibliothèque Nationale 25518, fol. 6, vo. This passage will be quoted in a moment.

protection which he has always afforded to widows and orphans. Compare the celebrated passages of the *Charroi*, ll. 306 ff. *Foucon de Candie* contains similar testimony.¹

L. 1680, one of the most awkward in the poem, separates two lines which have already appeared in juxtaposition (1089, 1090), and bears all the marks of clumsy "editing."

The passage 1720-28, where the five heroes are captured, has already been mentioned.² Of these five names, Reiner is replaced by Girard "fiz Cadele" in ll. 3154 and 3455, who, as will appear later, is none other than Girard the messenger. This knight perished in ll. 1145-74 (redaction A) and has been brought to life again. Can the same thing be said of the Guischard who is found among the prisoners in l. 1721? Is he the Guischard, nephew to Guibor, who perished with Girard? If not, he is probably the Guichart, brother to Vivien, who appears in many later poems, and who is the only other personage of this name in the cycle.³ This Guichart, brother to Vivien, appears in all the lists of prisoners in *Aliscans* and *Foucon*, and accompanies his uncle to the disastrous battle in all the manuscripts of the *Covenant*. Furthermore, a passage of *Foucon* states that he was to be William's heir. William says to Guibor after his flight from the field of the Archant and his arrival at Orange:

Las! mes linages est a declin tornez!
Mors est mes niés Vivien l' alosez,
Mes chiers amis qui ert de ma seror nez,
Et Guichars pris, uns nouviâx adoubez,
Que ja ne fust d'armés mauvès clamez,
Qui après moi tenist mes heritez.⁴

Foucon, then, like the *Willame*, makes the young brother of Vivien William's heir. There can be little doubt that the Guichart of *Foucon*, *Aliscans*, and the *Covenant* and the Guiot of the *Willame* are one and the same person. There can be little

¹Vide MSS of the British Museum, fol. 270, vo., and of the Bibliothèque Nationale 774, fol. 100, ro.

²Vide this *Journal*, Vol. II, pp. 232, 233.

³It should be added, however, that, in the *Enfances Vivien*, the personage of this name is a "relative" of Vivien according to MS a, his cousin, son of Beuve, according to MSS c and d, and his brother, according to MS b.

⁴MS of *Foucon*, British Museum, fol. 262, ro. a; MS 25518 of the Bib. Nat., fol. 6, vo.

doubt, too, that the Guischard of ll. 1721, 2257, 2485, 2520, 3055, 3154, and 3455 of the *Willame* is the same person as Guichart or Guiot; for, in addition to the reasons already apparent, the following is to be considered. In the remarkable passage beginning in l. 2343, Guibor asks of her husband what has become of his companions. She names all of those whom we have just seen captured, only she replaces *Guischard* by *Guiotun*, *Le bel enfant od la gente façon*. She says that she equipped him with arms. If, on the one hand, we have seen her arm Vivien's brother Guiot, of whom it is said, *N'out uncore .xv. anz, asez esteit petit* (l. 1440 of the *Willame*), on the other hand, we see her arm Guichart in the *Covenant*: *Cils estoit freres Vivien le vaillant. N'ot que .xv. anz, molt i ot bel enfant*.¹

What explanation can be offered for this change of name? None is apparent, unless it be that the presence of this personage in redactions A and B was impossible under one name. Satisfactory as this explanation may be, there remains the great, and perhaps unsolvable, question: What strange combination of circumstances can have placed side by side these two redactions? If B was evolved in the course of time, by natural process, from A, it would have preserved for Vivien's young brother the name of Guiot or Gui. If, after several generations, this derived text was combined with its original, then we can understand why the name might be changed in one or the other of these versions. But the preservation of A, the original of B, the circumstances which made their union desirable—these are difficulties that seek in vain a satisfactory solution. It appears, none the less, that Guischard and Guiot are one and the same person, and that the *remanieurs*, as a matter of course, do not wish us to suspect the fact.

Again, who is the Guielin mentioned by the side of Guischard in l. 1721? The poem offers no answer to this question. If we may trust *Aliscans*, the knight of this name who is taken prisoner is a son of Beuve de Comarcis; similarly in *Foucon*, where he is also called Gui. But Guiot (also called Gui) of the *Willame* is

¹ MS of the British Museum, fol. 138, vo. a; cf. the edition of Jonckbloet, 1156, 1157. In *Foucon*, Guibor says that she armed Guichart: *Je l'adoubai et ceins le branc d'acier*: MS of British Museum, fol. 280, vo. b.

given as the son of Beuve, which means that the Guielin of B—who is certainly the Guielin of *Aliscans*—is derived from the Gui of A, it being incredible that these names indicate different sons of Beuve. Yet how can both Guischard and Guielin come from the one person called Guiot or Gui? The change could hardly have taken place if all this numerous progeny (including Vivien) had continued to be ascribed to Beuve. The transfer of Vivien and Guichart to a new father—perhaps to Garin—would make perfectly natural the retention by Beuve of “Guielin” who is no other, it seems, than Gui.

In l. 1722, the names of Galter de Termes and Reiner stand side by side, and it will be noticed that each time these names occur they are placed as near together as possible.¹ This position is not an accidental circumstance, if we can trust the testimony of *Foucon*, which often shows traces of very ancient legends. We read in fact in this poem that Renier was the nephew of Gautier de Termes.²

L. 1724 shows that the hero beholds the taking prisoner of his nephews, and sets at rest one of the difficulties of *Aliscans*, for in this poem (save in the MS 1448 of the Bibliothèque Nationale) one cannot tell how William learns of their imprisonment. In MS 1448, he inquires of Vivien the fate of his other nephews, and is informed of their capture.

In ll. 1987 ff., William finds Vivien dying, but still able to speak. The passage may well cause surprise, for we have plainly witnessed his death (ll. 912–28),³ and the poem has spoken of him a number of times as dead. Several days have passed since he was hewn to pieces. The Saracens have disarmed the slain. If, as the text states (ll. 925–27), they carried his body away and placed it under a tree, that the Christians might not find it, the least that we can suppose is that they must have had enough

¹ Vide ll. 2371, 2372, 2484, 3054. Let it be said in passing that the spelling of these names in the original of the *Willame* was *Galtier* and *Renier*, as the assonance of the *laisse*, 2371 ff., indicates.

² We read of Renier: *Nez fu de Termes, de la soror Gautier*; MS of British Museum, fol. 271, ro.; MS of Bib. Nat., 774, fol. 101, vo.; MS of Bib. Nat., 25518, fol. 56, vo.

³ The hero, already fatally wounded, receives a blow which splits his head open, falls on his knees, and is hewn to pieces. In the *Foucon* of Stockholm there is a passage where Tibaut boasts of having slain Vivien, and adds the interesting statement: *Veiant mes oilz, li fis lo chief colper*, fol. 77, vo., communication of Mr. J. Runeberg.

interest in him to be sure that he was dead.¹ Several other things indicate that this passage is of a late redaction. In what has been called the redaction A,² the assonance shows that *-an* and *-en* were carefully separated. The *laisse* which describes the finding of Vivien by his uncle confuses these sounds. Similarly, the name *Vivien*, which up to this point has appeared only in assonance in *-ien* or in *-ié*, henceforth appears only in mixed *laissez*, *-an* and *-en* (ll. 2340, 2466). It is clear that in these *laissez* the name rimes in *-an*, as is the case in all the published poems of the cycle, save of course the *Chanson de Willame*.³ Another point: the *laisse* 1980-99 offers (beginning with l. 1987) the first passages of this poem which exist, in much the same form, in *Aliscans*. Compare ll. 1987-89:

Vivien trove [gisant] sor un estanc,
A la funtaine, dunt li duit sunt bruïant,
Desuz la foille d'un oliver mult grant,

with ll. 695-97 of *Aliscans*:⁴

Vivien vit gesir sor un estanc,
Desos un arbre foillu et verdoiant,
A la fontaine, dont li dois sont corant.

Compare also l. 1990: *Ses blanches mains croisies sur le flanc*, with *Aliscans*, 697: *Ses blanches mains sor son pis en croissant*;

¹ As a matter of fact, the l. 925, which states that the enemy carried away the body of Vivien, is probably original, and is supported by the logic of the occasion, as well as by the testimony of the *Nerbonesi* (N): Vol. II, p. 160. On the other hand, the two succeeding lines, as their substance and incorrectness indicate, are a later addition. One need only draw attention to the absurdity of hiding the body from the Christians, who have perished to a man long before the death of Vivien.

² The writer considers the *laisse*, beginning in l. 1879, as all the passages where Gui plays a vital rôle, as belonging to A. This *laisse* accordingly is pure, save for l. 1893, where an inversion of the last words suffices to make this long *laisse* entirely pure. We propose to read: *hardement mult grant*. In a poem which has evidently undergone many accidents, and not a few revisings, so slight a change in the order of these words would not be remarkable.

³ In the remarkable MS of Boulogne (No. 192, Bibl. de la ville), the name *Vivien* appears in the assonance, *-ié*. Because of the great interest which this ancient pronunciation offers, we copy from this MS a typical passage: fol. 85, vo. a:

"Qui dont veïst le vassal Vivien
Au branc d'achier les ruïstes cols paier,
Menbrer li peüst de hardi chevalier."

⁴ The edition quoted is that of Wienbeck, Hartnacke, and Rasch (Halle, 1903). It is clear that ll. 696, 697 should be inverted. For the reading *bruïant* of the *Willame*, cf. l. 5933 of *Aliscans*, which is identical.

l. 1991: *Plus suef flaroit qu' (nule) espece ne piment*, with *Aliscans*, 724: *Plus souef flaire ke baumes ne encens*; ll. 1992, 1993: *Parmi le cors out quinze plaies granz*; *De la menor fust morz uns amirails* (read *amiranz*), with *Aliscans*, 726, 727: *Parmi le cors ot quinze plaies grans*; *De la menor morust uns amirans*, etc. Again, the terms of the vow of Vivien, as related in this *laisse*, present just such a development of the vow mentioned hitherto as one would expect in a later redaction.¹ In the same way, the entire passage of this "death" of the young hero bears all the marks of a late redaction. It being granted that William was to return to the battlefield, one might almost predict that subsequent *remanieurs* would revive for a moment this favorite nephew that he might expire in his uncle's arms, after having received the supreme consolations of religion. The beauty and power of the scene show to this day the true inspiration and the sound judgment which brought to life again *Vivien le hardi*.

If l. 1987 marks a change in the epic, it is equally clear that the preceding line, *Guiot le vait de loinz adestrant*, arouses grave suspicions. It may be set down as a general rule that the appearance of Guiot is the occasion for difficulty. It has already been stated that he seems rather to belong to A than to B. The episodes concerning him present ragged edges on all sides, and

¹ *Vide* ll. 292; 586, 587; 597, 598; 809, 810; 902, 903; 910, 911. Concerning the vow, *vide*: *Enfances Vivien*, p. xxvi, *Romania*, Vol. XXVI, p. 187; *ibid.*, Vol. XXXII, p. 603; W. Cloetta, "Die Enfances Vivien," pp. 79-81 (in *Romanische Studien*, Heft IV, Berlin, 1898); A. F. Reinhard, *Die Quellen der Nerbonesi* (Altenburg, 1900) p. 73; "The Origin of the Covenant Vivien," pp. 44, 45 (in the *University of Missouri Studies*, Vol. I). The opinion expressed by the author of the last-mentioned work receives support from a passage in the *Covenant MS* of Boulogne, fol. 84, vo. b, where Vivien says:

"Jou remanrai, la covenanche est tes.
Quant jou estoie a Maldrane enserré
Ja jurai jou, voiant les marchans bers,
Que jamais ne fuioie por turc ne por esclés,
Puis que jou iere de mes armes armés.
A icel jor meisme que jou fui adoubés,
Oi jou en covent a dieu de majestés
Que jamais ne fuioie por turc ne por esclés,
Puis que jou iere de mes armes armés."

At the moment of his *adoubement*, when his uncle protests against his rash vow, Vivien replies (fol. 82, ro. a):

"Si m'ait diex, jou l'ai sor sâis juré,
Bien a .ii. ans aconplis et passés,
Quant jou estoie en Maldrane enserrés,
La je jurai voiant les marchans bers.
Ne puet autrement estre."

the passage under discussion offers no exception in this regard.¹ The purpose of l. 1986 is evidently to remove from the scene for the moment Guiot, who reappears after the death of Vivien, in l. 2071. The strangeness of this action appears in its true light when we consider that, of all persons, Guiot should be present at the death of his brother.² No poet, having brought events as far as the *laisse* under discussion, would have missed the opportunity of a death scene with William and Guiot present, Vivien's nearest and dearest of kin, unless an established tradition had stood in the way.

The location of Termes (in l. 2002: *Jo t'adubbai a mun palei a Termes*) remains as obscure as before the discovery of the new *chanson*. It is interesting to note that in the *Covenant*, MS of Boulogne, the young hero, after being knighted, sets out on his expedition from Termes: *De Termes departi Vivien le vallant*.³

We are told all at once in l. 2054 that William desires to carry the body of Vivien to Orange, here mentioned for the first time in the action of the poem. Few passages come with such a shock of surprise. We have seen the hero march out of Barcelona, qualified as *la bone cité* (l. 1082), and, apparently at least, return thither, only to set out again from *la bone cité* (l. 1504). Guibor remains behind in *la bone cité* (l. 1508).⁴ Now we are told that he is going to Orange, where in fact he arrives (l. 2211), and

¹ These remarks are not meant in any way to detract from the literary merit of the passages concerning the diminutive Guiot. These passages are among the most delightful of the poem. Guiot, while having a charm of his own, reminds us at times of Auberon.

² Such a scene occurs toward the close of the *Covenant Vivien*, in the MS of Boulogne: fol. 92, vo. b, William has found Vivien fatally wounded. While he is lamenting him, Vivien's brother joins them.

³ MS of Boulogne, fol. 82, ro. b.

⁴ An extremely interesting passage of *Foucon* shows that a poem must have existed in which Guibor was present at Barcelona. Tibaut complains of his enemies:

Fait m'ont Orange et Portpailart lessier.
En Barcelone ont mise ma moullier.

MS of British Museum, fol. 279, vo. b; cf MS of Bib. Nat., 778, fol. 206, vo; MS of Bib. Nat., 774, fol. 118, ro. Another passage in the same poem is to be compared with these lines. It is a question of the wealth of Guibor:

"Car plus a or Guibort en sa baillie
Qu'il n'e a dus qu'as pors de Hongrie.
A Bargelune estoit sa tresorie,
Et a Orange Tibaut d'Esclavonie.
Tot l'ot Guibort en la soie baillie."

MS of Boulogne, fol. 211, ro. b.

where—a new surprise—he finds Guibor, whom we have so recently left at Barcelona! Such a contradiction must clearly have been imposed on the *remanieur* by the sources he was utilizing, for of himself he could not have begotten such a combination of events.

The episode of Alderufe (ll. 2095 ff.) arouses suspicion for several reasons. For example, the striking lines that Alderufe addresses to William offer difficulty:

Vus n'estes mie [quons] Bertram ne Willames,
Ne Guielin ne dan Walter de Termes,
Ne [quons] G[u]ischard ne Girard qui's cadele.¹

In the first place, what has been said of the capture of the heroes mentioned in ll. 1720 ff., applies to the present list of names.² In the second place, Guischard and Girard appear to be the two knights slain earlier in the poem.³ As for the second of these two names, it certainly indicates by the words *quis cadele*, the hero who was sent by Vivien to Barcelona, and who guided William to the battlefield.⁴ But, it will be answered, if we take the poem as it stands, the present battle follows the first at an interval of only a few days. Perhaps Alderufe is supposed not to know that Girard is dead. This objection is not very sound, for many passages could be cited from the ancient epics showing that the simple art of that time represented the news of a hero's death as being known at once by all who take part in the battle. That such is the case, and that our poem here brings to life a dead hero, appears from two other passages. In ll. 3152–55 the five prisoners who have just been liberated greet William. Among them appears *Girard fiz Cadele*, which is evidently a conjecture of some scribe. The true reading is that mentioned above in

¹ Ll. 2097–99. See, for purposes of literary comparison, a passage in the *Nerbonois*, ll. 4700, 4701.

² The lines referred to are to be found in *Modern Philology*, Vol. II, p. 233, n. 1.

³ Ll. 1133 ff.

⁴ That Girard performed this office is stated in ll. 1786, 1787. The Saracens see Gui riding rapidly away, and exclaim:

“Cist nus querrat co que Girard nus quist,
Quant il Willame nus amenat ici.”

N, Vol. II. p. 162, corroborates this testimony.

l. 2099: *Girard quis cadele*. The defective reading is to be found a second time in l. 3455. It should be added that in all three of these passages Guischard is named in the same line with Girard, which makes the three lines identical, save for the word *fiz* instead of *quis*. The poem, then, brings to life Girard, who was dead, and there can be little doubt but what the same may be said of Guischard. We are dealing with one phase of the later redaction, which represents these knights as being captured, whereas in the older redaction they perished. We have already seen Vivien brought to life in the redaction B.

A second thing that surprises us somewhat in the episode of Alderufe is the name of this Saracen hero. A Saracen of this name is said to have fallen at the hand of Vivien, and the account of this deed of arms bears all the marks of the highest antiquity.¹ If, as many things indicate, the redaction B omitted all mention of Barcelona, and began at a point in the action represented by what has been called the third stage in the development of the legend,² what more natural than that the name Alderufe should have survived in tradition as that of a redoubtable pagan? In this event, a *remanieur*, in need of a name for a Saracen leader, could not do better than to call him Alderufe. Yet why suppose, someone will say, that the present episode is the work of a *remanieur*? In answer it may be said that the name of the Saracen at least as has been seen, cannot be primitive in this episode, whether we regard the poem as a unit or as composite. Furthermore, the episode bears a great resemblance to that of Deramé, as a careful perusal of the two passages will show. It is likely that Alderufe replaces Deramé, and that the passage in question is the derivative in B of this episode of Deramé in A.³ To discuss properly this question, which is closely bound up with that of Aerofle, Aquin, and Baudus in *Aliscans*, would require the space of a separate article. Let us mention, however, one additional point which indicates that behind Alderufe is hidden Deramé. There existed a legend—not the most ancient one, to

¹ *Vide* ll. 370-83, 634-47.

² *Modern Philology*, Vol. II, pp. 15, 16.

³ The episode of Deramé, in common with all those in which Guiot plays an important rôle, is considered to belong to redaction A.

be sure—which placed the seat of Deramé at Palerne.¹ This name occurs four times in the episode of Alderufe.²

L. 2231: *Paenes armes li pendent al costez*, is of value in understanding the episode of Alderufe. In fact, no mention is made of William's bearing away pagan armor, as here represented. It is clear, however, from a passage which follows (ll. 2275–95), that the Saracens mistake him for Alderufe. Of course, the fact that he mounts the well-known horse of Alderufe may be supposed to aid in the deception; none the less, he certainly bears some of the pagan's armor.³

In ll. 2309–11 occurs the statement that William's nose underwent its disfigurement in the battle with Tibaut, by which is meant the battle before Orange, described earlier in the poem.⁴

The remarkably fine scene, beginning in l. 2328, in which Guibor inquires of her husband the fate of his men, is filled with difficulties. Almost nothing squares with the departure of William as we have seen it—neither the names of the knights nor the number of his men.⁵ The clearness and definiteness of her questions leaves no doubt but what she herself saw depart the heroes mentioned in ll. 2343 ff. The general impression is certainly that the departure took place from the city where Guibor now is—from Orange. The young companions of Guillaume are the same that were mentioned in ll. 1720 ff., save that *Guiotun* replaces *Guischard*.

The passage concerning Guiotun, ll. 2357–70, offers considerable difficulty. As has already been said,⁶ the description of the arming of this hero does not agree in a single detail with that of

¹ *Vide Aliscans*, l. 30a, edition of Wienbeck, Hartnacke, and Rasch; *Covenant Vivien*, l. 1690. The MS of Boulogne of the *Covenant* makes no mention of Palerne in this *laisse*; fol. 91, vo. b.

² Ll. 2104, 2160, 2209, 2277.

³ One constant trait in the various episodes (*Willame* and *Aliscans*) concerning Alderufe seems to be the seizing of his arms. It may well be that the mere mention of his name in the episode under discussion ended by creating the belief that William despoiled his adversary.

⁴ In an interesting and valuable variant of *Aliscans*, Tibaut himself is said to have wounded the hero in the face: see the edition of Wienbeck, Hartnacke, and Rasch, l. 1643d. For the battle with Tibaut, see *Willame*, ll. 665–75.

⁵ William's departure is related in ll. 1504–23. For the number of men as given, see ll. 1506; 2337; 2382, 2383; 2515; 2244.

⁶ *Modern Philology*, Vol. II, p. 232.

the arming of Guiot (ll. 1540–51), but shows an absolute discord. The MS bears in l. 2357 the name *Guiotun* in full, but this may be a conjecture of some scribe for *Guischardun*, a more probable reading.¹ In fact, there can be little doubt that Guischart in B replaces Guiot, and is, as in subsequent poems, the brother of Vivien.

Ll. 2379, 2380 contain an obscure reference to aid which Guibor is able to offer in the raising of a new army. There is probably an omission of one or two lines before l. 2378. The poem makes no further mention of this aid.

The reference to the decoration of the walls of the palace of Guibor, in ll. 2398–2400, is to be compared with other well-known passages.

The hero says in ll. 2409–12 that Guibor has no reason to weep, having lost none of her family, whereas, on the contrary, he may well lament, since he has lost his noble kinsmen. One may explain the statement that Guibor has lost none of her family by saying that this applies only to the expedition which has just terminated. Everything indicates, however, that such an explanation would be straining the point, and that in the redaction B there exists no longer the slightest remembrance of the fact that Guischart, who perished in A, was the nephew of Guibor.

In ll. 2413–18 William suggests that he flee to Saint-Michel-al-Péril-de-la-Mer or to a desert, and become a hermit, and that Guibor become a nun. With her answer,

Sire, dist ele, ço ferum nus assez
Quant nus aurom nostre siecle mené,

are to be compared similar words with which she comforts him at a moment of discouragement in *Foucon de Candie*:

En l'autre siecle aurons assez sejour,
Celi gardons dont nous veons la flour.²

The departure of Guillaume from Orange (ll. 2421 ff.) differs in two important ways from the corresponding scene in *Aliscans*.

¹ *Foucon*, according to the edition of Tarbé, p. 7, shows this form. The MS of Boulogne of the *Covenant* offers the diminutive, *Guichardin*, as does also the MS of Boulogne of the *Enfances Vivien*, Wahlund and Feilitzen (Upsala and Paris, 1895), and MS 1448 of the Bibliothèque Nationale in l. 5 of *Aliscans*. The form *Guichardet* is well known.

² MS of British Museum, fol. 263, vo. c.

The adieux of Guibor and Guillaume, as the beautiful passage in the latter epic (1969–2004) may be called, are lacking. The attempt has been made elsewhere to show that this scene took place originally between Guibor and Bertram in the lost *Siège d'Orange*.¹ Parts of the *Siège* seem to have been utilized in *Aliscans*, but not in the *Willame*, at the moment of the final redaction of which the *Siège* probably still preserved its identity. The second point of difference between the scenes of departure in the two epics consists in the fact that, while in *Aliscans* the city is closely beset by the enemy, so that William has difficulty in passing their lines, in the *Willame* this is so far from being the case that he rides away unmolested, accompanied by a mere lad. Here again *Aliscans* appears to represent the action of the *Siège d'Orange*, according to which the city was closely invested at the time when the messenger went northward for help.

The fact that the king is much more kindly disposed toward William than in *Aliscans* is apparent from ll. 2495–2504.

One of the most important passages of the entire poem is to be found in ll. 2505 ff. The king inquires of William what has brought him to court, and the hero answers in these words:

- Sire, dist il, jal savez vus assez,
 2510 Jo aveie Espaigne si ben aquitez
 Ne cremeie home que de mere fust nez,
 Quant me mandat Vivien l' alosé
 Que jo menasse d'Orange le barné.
 Il fu mis nies, nel poeie veier.
 2515 Set mile fumes de chevalers armez.
 De tuz icels ne m'est un sul remés.
 Perdu ai Vivien l'alosed.
 Mis nies Bertram i est enprisoné
 Le fiz Bertram de Brusban la cité,
 2520 Et Guielin et Guischard al vis cler.

We have here a fairly good statement of the action according to version B. William evidently was summoned from Orange by

¹ Vide "Messenger in *Aliscans*," in *Harvard Studies in Philology and Literature*, Vol. V, 1896. The battle which terminated the *Siège* is mentioned in ll. 665–75 of the *Willame*.

Vivien, who was in the Archamp.¹ Orange and the Archamp are two fixed points in the disastrous expedition. The Archamp, as we have seen, is somewhere near Barcelona or Tortosa. When the hero says, then, that he had so thoroughly conquered Spain that he feared no man, we must understand the line of his thought to be: "But I was mistaken, for Vivien, who was in Spain, summoned me to bring my army to his aid." The fact that Vivien was in Spain is supposed to be known to the king, and, indeed, a statement of his presence there can hardly have been necessary, if we may judge from the testimony of the poems concerning him, for they all—save *Aliscans*—place the scene of his exploits in Spain, as does, in fact, the earlier form of *Aliscans*, the *Chanson de Willame*. External evidence shows that there was a connection between Vivien and the conquest of Spain mentioned by his uncle, as has been asserted elsewhere by the writer. A search in the manuscripts of *Foucon* and of the *Covenant Vivien* will support this assertion. The MS of Boulogne of the latter epic, for example, tells how Vivien invades Spain, takes Barcelona, the towers of Balesgués, Tourtolouse, and Portpallart, and gives all these cities to his uncle William.² It is because of these conquests of Vivien that the Saracens march against him. We gather from passages in *Foucon* that William and Guichart went

¹ We have just seen, from the questions of Guibor on her husband's return, that the army must have started from Orange. It is to be noted that the list of heroes mentioned above (and the fuller list in ll. 2483-85) includes all those whom she names as having accompanied William—save, of course, Guiotun, who is replaced by Guischart. Again, the number of men as given in l. 2515, is the number who ought to be with William on his return, according to what Guibor says in l. 2244. As to whether Vivien summoned his uncle from the Archamp, the words of ll. 2481, 2482 leave no doubt: *Car jo repair de l'Archamp sur mer U jo ai perdu Vivien l'alosed*. The same statement is repeated in ll. 2253, 2254, and is to be inferred from many other passages.

² Fol. 82, vo. a. According to this MS, Vivien was not accompanied by his uncle during the conquest of "Spain." MS 1448, of the Bibliothèque Nationale, however, shows by one passage that, as in the *Nerbonesi* (Vol. II, pp. 91 ff.), a legend existed telling how William, Vivien, Bertram, and others of the family had taken part in the conquest. Later, Vivien and his men are reduced to straits in the battle of the Archant. He proposes that they try to take refuge in a castle. He says:

"Se la poiens un poi prandre herberge,
 Bien nos tenrons par force e par poeste
 Tant que secorre nos revenra Guillelme,
 Li cuens Bertram e dans Gautiers de Termes,
 Gaudins li bruns, li pros e li honest(r)es,
 Hunaut de Saintes, qui mainte joste a fete,
 Qui a Orengie ont reforbis lor helmes,"

— Fol. 208, vo. b.

from Orange to Barcelona, and marched from there to the aid of Vivien, who was near Tortelouse (Tortosa).¹ Vivien perishes, Guichart, Girart, and Guielin are taken prisoners, and William flees alone. One cause of the war between the Saracens and Christians is said to be the capture by William and his companions of Barcelona, Portpaillart, and at least one other city, and the operations against Tortelouse are said to have ended in the death of Vivien.

It is needless to draw attention to the close parallel between this testimony of the *Covenant* and of *Foucon* and that of the passage of the *Willame* under discussion.

In ll. 2518, 2519, quoted above, Bertram is said to be the son of Bertram. We have, however, seen his father called Bernard de Bruban or de Brusban in ll. 2256, 2344 (cf. 669-72). One might suppose the name *Bertram* in l. 2519 to be an error, but another passage indicates that this is not the case. In ll. 3216 ff. a Christian hero is vanquished and in his flight calls upon several of the bravest of the Christians for help. L. 3224 reads: *Allas! dist il le fiz Bertram, mar fui!* which can only refer to the Bertram of l. 2518. When we reflect that Wolfram von Eschenbach in the *Willehalm* calls one of William's brothers Bertram, there can be little doubt that the reading of l. 2519 is not due to an error. The different relationship assigned the young Bertram constitutes an important difference between the part of the poem which precedes this passage and that which follows.

We are told in l. 2524 that the king who has just learned of the terrible defeat in the Archamp, weeps for Bertram, who has been captured, but nothing is said of his grief for Vivien, who has been slain. This certainly indicates that there was more intimacy between the king and Bertram than between the king and Vivien. According to the *Nerbonesi*, Bernard, the father of Bertram, married a sister of Louis.² Trace of this legend may exist in l. 2524.

It is interesting to note, in ll. 2553, 2559, the presence of Garin, who is absent in *Aliscans* according to nearly all the

¹ MS of British Museum, fol. 280, vo. Vivien is said to be attacked near this city by Tibaut, in the *Covenant*, MS of Berne, fol. 10, ro., b, where the city is called *Toulouse*, a form found occasionally for *Tortelouse*.

² Vol. I, pp. 84, 93, 248.

manuscripts.¹ A few words may be said at this moment of the brothers who appear in the *Willame*. They are: Hernald (ll. 2551, 2564), Garin, Boeve (ll. 2560, 2930, 2985), Guibelin (l. 2565). The name *Ernard li barbez* (l. 2986) is probably a mistaken reading for *Bernard*, who may well be mentioned here, in spite of the fact that the father of Bertram is said, in this part of the poem, to be Bertram. We find, in fact, present side by side in the *Willehalm* Bertram and Bernard, both brothers to William. If the reading *Ernard* is for *Bernard*, all the epic brothers of William, save Aïmer, appear. It is probable that this hero, under the spelling *Naimer*, was originally mentioned in l. 2986, and that an early copyist confused his name with that of his father, *Naimeri*—a confusion of which numerous examples exist in other manuscripts.²

In ll. 2587, 2588, the king says that he himself will march to the relief of Orange. The queen, who has not been hitherto mentioned, protests vehemently, saying that Guibor, who knows all the art of herbs, would poison him, that William would then be king, and Guibor queen. This speech, startling in its reality, occasions the violent and brutal outburst of William, in which he applies to her the most opprobrious language that can be applied to a woman. He starts to draw his sword to slay her, but the intervention of his father prevents the crime. L. 2628 states that the queen is William's sister. There is an element of improbability in this masterly scene, as in that of *Aliscans*: the jealousy and hatred which the two principal actors seem to have for each other is surprising between two children of Aymeri. The attitude

¹ The MS of Boulogne represents all the brothers as present, and names Garin: see variant under l. 4635, in the edition of Rolin, or in that of Wienbeck, Hartnacke, and Rasch. MS 2494 of the Bib. Nat. also names Garin: see variant of l. 7736. The writer has expressed the opinion that, originally, Garin was present in *Aliscans: Messenger in Aliscans*, pp. 145, 146; "Aïmer le Chétif," in *Publications of the Modern Language Assoc. of America*, Vol. XVII (1902), pp. 423 ff. On the other hand, W. Cloetta has expressed the opinion that Garin was introduced in some poem later than *Aliscans*: vide, *Enfances Vivien* (Berlin, 1898), pp. 91 ff. (*Romanische Studien*, Heft IV). If this personage is absent from the majority of the MSS of *Aliscans*, the fact may indicate that he was considered the father of Vivien. The legend which represented Vivien's father as dead seems to have been current in the oldest monuments.

² The reading of the MS in l. 2986 is, as printed: *Naimeris*, written in full. Let it be said that the spelling of the name *Aïmeri* without *N* in the first part of the poem, and with *N* in the subsequent part, offers important evidence of a complex origin for the epic. Vide ll. 298, 1437, 2552, 2557, 2625, 2931, 2986, 3166.

of the queen appears especially strange in a family which typifies mutual loyalty and support. That the only person at court to oppose William should be his own sister is highly improbable. It is likely that the woman here called queen was not originally sister to William.

The mention of Tedbalt in l. 2603 explains one of the most obscure and improbable allusions of *Aliscans*: ll. 2772-74. There has been confusion between two entirely different persons, Tibaut de Bourges or de Berry, and Tibaut l'Escler. Similarly, a most interesting passage of *Foucon* would probably never have been correctly interpreted, had it not been for the light thrown on Tibaut de Bourges by the *Chanson de Willame*. In the passage referred to, a messenger announces to Beuve de Comarcis the imprisonment of his two sons, the death of Vivien, the flight of William. William, he says, is in a fearful situation:

“Car de bataille s'en est fuiant tornez.
Mort sont si home n'en est nus eschapez,
Et Vivien, qui tant ert redoutez.
Et Guichardés est en prison menez;
Andeus tes filz que tu as engendrez
En ont paien en la mer esquipez.”
“He las! pecchieres! qui les en a menez?”
“En non dieu, sire, Thiebaus et Desramez.
Or est besoinz de vos enfanz pensez.”¹

The above is the reading of the MS of the British Museum. The MS 25518 of the Bibliothèque Nationale shows that Tibaut de Bourges is probably referred to, and not Tibaut l'Escler. According to this MS, the messenger replies as follows to Beuve's question:

“Cil de Berri, qui tant par est dotez²
De coardie [de] honte et vergondez.
Jamès a cort ne doit estre mandez.”³

Cil de Berri is, of course, *Thiebaus de Berri* or *de Bourges*, whose confusion with Tibaut l'Escler may be responsible for the mention of Deramé. Let it be added that this invaluable passage

¹ *Foucon de Candie*, MS of British Museum, fol. 262, vo. c.

² This word has been expunctuated, and *provez* written above.

³ MS 25518 of the Bib. Nat., fol. 11, ro.

offers new evidence for the identification proposed in this article of *Boeve cornebut al marchis* (ll. 297, 1436) with Beuve de Comarcis. The tradition which made Tibaut de Bourges responsible for the misfortune of the children of Beuve de Comarcis was so well established that it persisted, even after one of these children, Vivien, was transferred to another parentage and replaced by Girart.¹

Ll. 2598–2600 are among the most obscure in the poem.

The reference in l. 2611, *Mielz li venist qu'il t'eüst decolée*, is not clear. The person indicated by *li* is doubtless the king. One would infer from the passage that allusion is made to some definite occasion when the king forgave a very serious offense.

It is to be noted that the reconciliation with the queen, which occurs in *Aliscans*, is lacking here, and that we are spared the stupid episodes of Aelis.

L. 2647, as has been said, marks the beginning of the *Renoart*.² Rarely have independent poems been united with such consummate skill. The literary value of the *Renoart* was clearly greater than has generally been supposed, a fact which must have facilitated the uniting of the two poems. Certain differences of language and versification are observable after l. 2647. For example, the word *ço* followed by a vowel, which has occurred rather frequently hitherto, is not found after this point. The *i* of *li*, nominative singular masculine of the definite article, followed by a vowel, is not written after l. 2647, although it appears many times in what precedes, where it is elided or not. After this line, the personal pronoun, *lui*, becomes more frequent than hitherto, and is used almost exclusively with prepositions. Again, of the last six hundred lines of the poem, about two-thirds assonate in *-é*, which, it is needless to say, is in striking contrast with what precedes. The *laissez*, too, in this part of the poem are of such great length

¹ Several critics have committed an error with regard to the two sons of Beuve who are captured according to *Foucon*. W. Cloetta has given a correct statement of this question: "Die Enfances Vivien," in *Romanische Studien*, Heft IV, pp. 65 ff. In fact, the MSS of *Foucon* name Girart and Gui (also called Guielin) as the sons of Beuve. Girart seems to have been transferred to Beuve after Vivien was ascribed to another. There can be but little doubt that Girart is the Girard of the *Willame*, whom Vivien — while he was still considered a son of Beuve — calls cousin. After the change in Vivien's parentage, this Girard appears to have been awarded to Beuve, which gave him the traditional number of sons.

² It is interesting to note that, at the corresponding place in *Aliscans*, Rolin marked a significant division in the text: *Vide* his edition, p. 96 (l. 3146 of the edition of Guessard and Montaiglon).

that one cannot believe them to come from the same source as the first part of the epic. The all but total absence of the peculiar refrain of the beginning of the poem may be taken to indicate that this refrain did not close the *laissez* in the original *Renoart*. The few cases of this refrain at the very end of the poem seem placed there designedly, as if to give the whole an appearance of unity.¹

In the return of the hero to Orange, there are important divergences from the story as told in *Aliscans*: in this latter epic, William's brothers, the king, the queen, and Aelis accompany the army as far as Orleans. The brothers go each to his own fief to raise an army. William marches rapidly to Orange, enters the city without difficulty, mounts to the palace, and from there sees the arrival of his brothers and their troops. Objection has justly been made against the absurdity and awkwardness of these events. The action of the *Willame* is much more reasonable, in that it omits all of the Orleans episode, and also the incredible *Endementiers* scene—that of the arrival before the city of the hero's brothers. The *Willame*, it is true, contains one of the inconsistencies of *Aliscans*: the entry of William at Orange without striking a blow. The poem has stated that the city is besieged (ll. 2580–85, cf. 2486, 2487, 2527, 2528), yet the Christians enter Orange without the slightest difficulty (ll. 2789 ff.). Indeed,

¹ The inference has already been drawn from the placing of the refrain at the close of several of the final *laissez* of the *Willame* that the poem is complete and not a fragment.

A word may be said here concerning the peculiar refrain of the *Willame*. It seems to be the original form of the *petit vers* of the *Cycle de Guillaume*. But why did the first element of the refrain—the long line of feminine assonance—disappear? No reason is evident, unless the difficulty of the two feminine assonances. However possible such a refrain in a poem in assonance, it would become considerably more difficult to handle effectively in a rimed poem.

It is interesting to note that, just as scholars were beginning to consider the *petit vers* as not original, the discovery of the *Willame* opens the question anew, and seems to give reason to Jonckbloet, G. Paris, Gautier, W. Cloetta, Ph. A. Becker, and others, who saw in the *petit vers*—save, of course, where it was an evident imitation—an evidence of antiquity. The following critics have opposed the theory of G. Paris: A. Nordfelt, *Enfances Vivien* (1895); O. Riese, *Uevertlieferung der Enfances Vivien* (dissertation at Halle, 1900), p. 30; O. Schultz-Gora, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, (1900), pp. 370 ff.; E. Wienbeck, *Aliscans I*, (dissertation, Halle, 1901), pp. 14–17; W. Harnacke, *Aliscans* (Halle, 1904), p. xix. In the prefatory note to the new edition of *Aliscans*, H. Suchier announces that the editors will publish in an appendix an argument to prove that the *petit vers* in this epic is not primitive. Such an attempt at this moment would be most interesting. It would at least lack the complacency which has characterized most of the above-mentioned articles. The view that the *petit vers* is not original has been opposed recently by J. Runeberg, *Études sur la geste Rainouart* (Helsingfors, 1905), pp. 21 ff.

to meet the Saracens, they are obliged to march to the Archamp, evidently supposed not to be far from Orange.

One of the most important, and at the same time difficult, passages of the entire poem occurs in ll. 2795–2805. Guibor inquires of her husband what he has accomplished in France, and he replies that he has succeeded well, and that he has good twenty thousand men whom the emperor has given him, in addition to the forces of his relatives. Guibor inquires whether the emperor is coming, and William says no, that he is lying ill at Aix-la-Chapelle:

“Ne vient il dunc?” “Nun, dame.” “Ço m’est laid.”

“Malade gist a sa chapele a Es.”

Et dist Guibure: “Cest vers avez vus fait.

S’il ore gist, ja ne releve il mes!”

“Ne voille Deu, qui tote rien a fait!” (2085)

This passage, in spite of the obscurity of the third line, contains a clear contradiction with what precedes, for the king is perfectly well, and is not at Aix-la-Chapelle, but at Laon. Can it be supposed that William is telling a falsehood, in a laudable desire to protect his suzerain? Hardly. In the first place, the almost certainty that the deception would be discovered, for he came accompanied by so many who had witnessed the events at Laon; in the second place, if he were lying, he would mention Laon and not Aix, to make his falsehood seem as reasonable as possible. Not only had he just come from Laon, but if one can judge from monuments still extant, a connection between Louis and Aix-la-Chapelle was very unusual. It is much more likely that the action of the *Renoart* was placed during the lifetime of Charlemagne, and that he is the emperor referred to in this singular passage.

It is stated in l. 2825 (cf. ll. 2874, 3355, 3538) that the mother of Renoart—and consequently that of Guibor—is called Oriabel, which is evidently the same as the *Orable* mentioned in the later poems, as the pagan name of Guibor. In our poem the only name given William’s wife is Guibor. Few points are more obscure than the origin of the two names of this princess.

A passage of interest occurs in ll. 3056, 3057 ff., where Renoart

asks Bertram if he knows how to guide a boat. Bertram answers that formerly he knew quite well how to do it:

“Bertram, sire, sez tu ben gouverner?”

“Oil, ami, jo en soi ja dis assez.”

While this conversation may arise out of the circumstances of the action, it is at least possible that it was suggested by the appellation *Timonier* which signifies “helmsman,” so often added to the name of Bertram.¹ There must have existed at one time an episode which justified this strange title.

In ll. 3132–39 Bertram slays Malagant, who, he says, had inflicted many woes upon him in the boat. This Saracen is called *Morgant le notonier* in *Foucon*, and Morando in the *Nerbonesi*.²

The passage ll. 3162–68 mentions the fact that William is resolved to give to Renoart a wife of noble lineage, and we infer from what is said that she will be of his own family, probably a niece. We learn in l. 3499 that this lady is named Ermentrud. An interesting variant of the manuscript of Venice of *Aliscans* states that Hermengard gave him her niece Ermentrut in marriage.³

The close of the poem—the forgetting by William of Renoart, his consequent wrath, with all that follows—shows more skill than that of the corresponding passages of *Aliscans*. The simple art of the two lines near the end in which Guibor tells Renoart that she is his sister is really charming. He has related the story of his life:

¹For this appellation applied to Bertram *vide Aliscans*, ed. Rollin, ll. 154, 158; ed. Guessard, ll. 4929–31; ed. Wienbeck, Hartnacke, and Rasch, ll. 144, 4931, variant. This edition omits in the variants a line which follows 140 in the MS of London: *Diez! com grant duel li fist li timoniers*, cited by Rolin. The line occurs also in MS 24369 of the Bib. Nat. The word is applied to Bertram a number of times in *Foucon de Candie*; for example: *Quant nous veismes Bertan le timonier*, MS of London, fol. 269, ro. c; MS 25518 of the Bib. Nat., fol. 49, vo.; *Et vait secourre Bertran le timonier*, MS of London, fol. 282, vo. a; MS 25518, fol. 98, ro.; *Et le desroi Bertran le timonier*, MS 774 of the Bib. Nat., fol. 114, vo.; *Bertram le tesmoinier*, MS of Boulogne, fol. 226, vo. b. The *Nerbonesi*, Vol. I, p. 378, say that Bertram received this name from the fact that he steadied and guided the *timon* of the cart intrusted to him in the *Charroi de Nîmes*. This explanation is, of course, false, for the word signifies “helmsman.” Indeed, the variant for l. 4931 of *Aliscans* in one of the most original of the MS—No. 2494 of the Bib. Nat.—bears *noitunes* instead of *timonier*. See for this title applied to Bertram: *Romania*, Vol XXVIII, pp. 128, 129.

²*Foucon*, MS of London, fol. 264, ro. a; MS 25518 of the Bib. Nat., fol. 20, ro.; N, II, pp. 222 ff.

³Ed. of Rolin, variant following l. 3875.

Guibure l'oi, si passad avant:
 "Baisez mei, frere, ta soror sui naissant!"

Of all the *chansons de geste*, the *Willame* is perhaps the most difficult to comprehend. It is like a mysterious landscape which never presents twice the same appearance. One's impression at the second reading of this epic is not that at the first, and that of the tenth reading differs widely from that of the fifth. Many things in the poem are hidden below the surface, and are only slowly discernible, if at all. Because of this quality of hidden mystery, and because of its great age, the *Chanson de Willame* will be more frequently cited both by critics and admirers of literature than any other poem of the great cycle.

During the year and a half since the first pages of this study were written, the author's views have changed concerning many things in the epic, only a few of which fortunately had been touched upon by him.¹ The most important of these things concerns the exact point at which the redaction B begins. The language of the text shows no line of demarkation before the *laisse*, ll. 1980 ff. Accordingly, if a point is to be indicated where the later redaction begins, this is the place. Again, all of the evidence indicates that the passage beginning in l. 1720, where the "nephews" are captured, belongs to the later redaction. These lines, for example, do not belong in their present *laisse*, as their assonance shows. In addition, the young heroes, as has been made clear, did not set out with William from Barcelona, but rather must be supposed to have accompanied him in the departure from Orange—the departure which is not described in the poem as we have it.

Another opinion expressed which seems erroneous is that several of the young "nephews" mentioned in ll. 1720 ff. may

¹In the matter of errors, a few are to be found in the second article, the author not having seen the proofs: in this *Journal*, Vol. II, p. 235, n. 2 should be erased, as should, on p. 248, the second sentence of the second paragraph. In the second sentence below this point, the words "her nephew" should be inserted after the name *Guichart*. In the first article, the words *amunt Girunde*, which were considered to mean: *a Mont Gironde* (vide this *Journal*, Vol. II, p. 8) really mean: *amont Gironde*, and the copyist indicates by them the river. There is a contradiction between the geography of the episodes concerning Tedbalt and that of the remainder of the poem, and the writer is more and more inclined to believe that these episodes were originally independent of the passages which follow them. See, for a fuller discussion of these questions, the *Romania*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 250 ff.

come from the list of those who originally accompanied William in the victorious expedition. Long reflection has convinced the writer that this is not the case, and that the only nephew who accompanied William in this expedition was Guiot.

In this hurried examination of the poem, questions of external and cyclic relations have been intentionally neglected, because to treat them even briefly would have required too much space. Enough has been said, however, to indicate that of the extant sources in Old French, *Foucon de Candie* shows the greatest knowledge of the most ancient legends preserved in the *Chanson de Willame*.

Critics will not be wanting to assert that the *Chanson de Willame* is a literary unit and not composite in its origin. The scholars who, closing their eyes to the laws of formation of popular epic poetry, saw in *Aliscans* the product of a single poet, and who denied that this august monument could ever have existed in assonance, cannot be expected to see in the *Willame* anything else than the primitive form of the epic. Driven from one line of trenches by the discovery of the new song, they will fall back to another, as poorly constructed as the first. None the less, a better comprehension of what popular epic poetry is will certainly prevail in the end. All will see that to maintain that the *Chanson de Willame* is the product of one epoch and of one poet, is like standing in front of Notre Dame de Paris and ascribing it to one generation and to one architect.

RAYMOND WEEKS.

COLUMBIA, Mo.